

Remarks

The claims remaining in this application have been amended to make it clear that the present invention relates to the field of e-commerce and solves a problem of efficiently provide secure information to different groups of end users. The claims (as amended) clearly distinguish over the art of record.

A number of claims in this application were rejected over the teachings of US patent 5,926,245 - Katz, taken alone. However, as noted in the action, what Katz actually teaches is "a digital information library and delivery system with logic for generating files targeted to the playback device."

Katz neither teaches not suggests the concept of groups of end users. Mobile playback devices are not end users. Groups of mobile playback devices are not groups of end users. The Katz system is a library system, not an e-commerce system as contemplated by the present invention.

For other claims, Katz was cited in combination with 5,970,475 - Barnes, which is said to teach an electronic procurement system. The proposed combination of Barnes and Katz is clearly improper. For a combination of two prior art references to be proper, at least one of the references must teach not only how the combination could be achieved but also why it would be desirable to make the combination.

That rule is not satisfied here. The primary reference teaches a digital library system that says absolutely nothing about using or providing pricing information. The Barnes patent teaches the use of pricing information but in a data processing system that is completely unlike the Katz system. There is no logical basis for saying that it would somehow be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extract the one thing of interest in the Barnes patent (ie, the use of pricing information) and somehow superimpose pricing information onto the Katz system, which is absolutely devoid of any teaching relating to use of pricing information. Neither reference provides any reason whatsoever for a combination of the two.

It is submitted that the claims remaining in this application, as amended herein, clearly distinguish over the art of record and are allowable.

Respectfully Submitted,



Gerald R. Woods

Attorney Representing Applicant

Reg. No. 24,144

IBM Corporation

Intellectual Property Law

Department T81/Building 503

P.O. Box 12195

Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

Customer No. 25253

Phone: (919) 543-7204

FAX: 919-254-4330